

REMARKS

In the Notice of not Fully Responsive Reply for Applications under Accelerated Examination (referred to hereinafter as the "Notice"), the Examiner alleges that Applicants' Request for Reconsideration, filed November 27, 2006 includes arguments or other items that are not limited to the rejections, objections, and requirements made. In particular, the Examiner alleges that "V-Commerce was withdrawn in favor of the recent patent issued to Nuance." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation that Applicants' Request for Reconsideration was not fully responsive.

Applicants' Request for Reconsideration was filed in response to the Office Action, dated August 25, 2006. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as non-statutory; rejects claims 2, 3, 5-7, 15-18, 20, 21, 23-25, 30, 33, 51, and 54-61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COHEN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,082,397) (which the Examiner appears to refer to in the Notice of not Fully Responsive Reply for Applications under Accelerated Examination as "the recent patent issued to Nuance"); rejects claims 4, 11-14, 22, 31, 34, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COHEN et al. in view Official Notice; rejects claims 8-10 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COHEN et al. in view of PTO-892: Item U (which corresponds to "Motorola, Visa, BroadVision and Others Team with Nuance to Introduce V-Commerce," PR Newswire, New York, October 6, 1998, pp. 1-4; which Applicants refer to as "V-COMMERCE"); rejects claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COHEN et al. in view MCCOLLOM et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,925,444); rejects claims 37, 38, 40-47, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/466,236
Attorney's Docket No. 0055-0037CIP1

over COHEN et al. in view V-COMMERCE, and further in view of MCCOLLOM et al.; and rejects claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COHEN et al. in view of V-COMMERCE, and further in view of MCCOLLOM et al. and Official Notice.

Applicants addressed each of these grounds of rejection in the Request for Reconsideration, including the rejections based on COHEN et al. (the recent patent issued to Nuance). Thus, Applicants submit that the Notice has been improperly issued.

Examiner Pond did not return Applicants' telephone call requesting clarification regarding this Notice. If the Examiner still believes that Applicants' Request for Reconsideration, filed November 27, 2006, is not fully responsive, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number below to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /John E. Harrity/
John E. Harrity
Registration No. 43,367

Date: March 20, 2007

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 58563